

Docket No.: 02849/000G277-USO

REMARKS

This Response is in reply to the Official Action mailed June 20, 2005. Claims 1 through 10 are now pending; no claims have been amended. Entry of this Response is requested as it is believed that the outstanding rejection by the Patent Office does not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness and that the claims are therefore in condition for allowance.

In the preceding Office Action, the claims stood rejected over Sosan, a primary reference, in view of the teachings of Ogilvie. In Applicant's submission of March 29, 2005, Ogilvie was removed as a reference against the claims. The outstanding Office Action again cites to Sosan as the primary reference, but for the first time rejects the claims as obvious over Sosan in view of newly cited Morello et al. However, the combination with Morello et al. fails to teach or suggest the claimed step of registering the placement of an article after the securing step, as recited in claim 1.

Proposed Combination Does Not Meet Claim limitations

Were one of skill in the art to modify Sosan in view of Morello et al., as the Patent Office has proposed,¹ the resulting system would include a scanner to register articles, but would still lack any feature suitable for performing the claimed step of registering the placement of the article "after the securing step," as recited in claim 1. In particular, the bar code scanner described by Sosan is

¹ The Morello et al. patent is classified (and its field of search is also) in non-overlapping categories than Sosan. Sosan is concerned with securely receiving articles whereas Morello et al. are concerned with dispensing and accepting return of reusable articles. Respectfully, persons of skill in the art of parcel delivery would not turn to the art area where the Morello et al. patent is classified for teachings relevant to parcel delivery.

{W:\02849\000G277000\00483263.DOC from MAIL ROOM TO MAIL ROOM}

Appl. No.: 09/454,770
Response Dated July 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Docket No.: 02849/000G277-US0

154 to read the article code on the cassette may be due to the bar code having been removed from the cassette, insertion of an improper cassette, or simply due to the bar code having been obscured for some reason. In any event, cassettes returned to the machine within case 30 which cannot be identified by the machine are kept and stored in the machine, and problems caused thereby are to be handled personally by the system operator. In such situations, the customer is provided with a receipt by printer 21 providing information regarding the system operator and advising the customer to contact same.

From this excerpt, Morello et al. is understood as not registering the placement of a particular parcel, but only those that are *proper* (that is, among articles known to the system). Thus, a videocassette may be returned to any one of a number of machines in a network of vending machines, registration of such articles is only if they are "proper," that is, a cassette that is expected to have been inserted in the first place. No such constraint exists in the claimed parcel delivery method, which as noted concerns a distinct methodology in which the carrier has the ability to access the secure receptacle, place the parcel within the accessed secure receptacle, and secure the secure receptacle after placing the parcel within the secure receptacle.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejections are requested.

{W:\02849\000G277000\00483263.DOC #####}

Appl. No.: 09/454,770
Response Dated July 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Docket No.: 02849/000G277-US0

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if she perceives of a basis for resolving any outstanding issues.

Dated: July 25, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
David Leason

Registration No.: 36,195
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

{W:\02849\000G277000\00483263.DOC Sent to USPTO by FAX (07/25/2005)}

Appl. No.: 09/454,770
Response Dated July 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 20, 2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY